

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 744

88

SP 011 026

AUTHOR Drummond, Robert J.; Littlefield, Maurice
TITLE Cooperative Teacher Education Program, 1972-1975.
Title III Project. Summative Report.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO 29-73-0303-0
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 59p.; For related document, see ED 083 156
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Programs; *Field Experience Programs;
*Internship Programs; Program Evaluation; Student
Attitudes; *Summative Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes;
*Teacher Education; *Teacher Interns; Teaching
Experience; Teaching Methods; Trainees

ABSTRACT

This program was designed to change education by changing the learning process in the training of future teachers. The goals of the project were: (1) to bring about change in the method of preparing teachers by the involvement of teacher trainees completely in the learning process through their participation during the academic year in public school classrooms so that the trainees may blend educational theory with practice; (2) to bring about an exchange of ideas and knowledge between the public school practitioner and the university instructor; (3) to individualize the learning situation for pupils in the public school classrooms through the presence of the trainees; (4) to utilize the resources of the university by the public schools by having the university directly involved in a cooperative project; (5) to break the cycle of passive learning by enabling the trainees to teach as they have learned. This report includes an analysis of the attitudes of both the student teacher interns and the pupils toward the program. The evaluation of the program by cooperating staff members, interns, and college personnel is included. The results and effectiveness of the program are included with recommendations for future projects of a similar nature. (JD)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED139744

SUMMATIVE REPORT
OF
COOPERATIVE TEACHER
EDUCATION PROGRAM
1972 - 1975

TITLE III PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Prepared by:

Robert J. Drummond, Ed.D.
Professor of Education
University of Maine at Orono

and

Maurice Littlefield, M.Ed.
Director of Development
University of Maine at
Portland-Gorham

S.A.D. #71
Kennebunk-Kennebunkport
Maine

SP 011 026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF TABLES	2
INTRODUCTION	3
CONTEXT	4
PERSONNEL	6
THE INTERNS	9
THE PROGRAM	9
THE OBJECTIVES	10
Objective 1 Achievement of Students	10
Objective 2 Attitude Toward School	12
Objective 3 Achievement of Cognitive Objectives by Interns	20
Objective 4 Teacher Attitudes	22
Objective 5 Performance of Interns	25
RATINGS OF COURSES TAKEN BY INTERNS 1972-75	28
ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF AND INTERNS TO THE COOPERATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM	32
FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION ON THE 1972-74 INTERNS	39
SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE COOPERATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM BY INTERNS, COOPERATING STAFF MEMBERS AND COLLEGE PERSONNEL	40
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	48
RECOMMENDATIONS	50

TABLE OF TABLES

TABLE 1	Comparison of the Means of the Subscales and Battery Totals on the Stanford Achievement Test for Project and Non Project Students Grades 1-6	11
TABLE 2	Comparison of the means of grade 1-8 students on the Attitude toward School Scale	15
TABLE 3	Comparison of the Means of the Project and Non-project Teachers on the Teacher Survey Form	23
TABLE 4	Ratings of Interns by Cooperating Teachers on the University of Maine (Portland-Gorham) Form	26
TABLE 5	Mean Ratings of Courses taken by trainees as to How Helpful Courses were in preparing them for Teaching	29
TABLE 6	Comparison of the means of Interns of 1974-75, Previous Interns 1972-74 and Project Staff to Perceptions of the Cooperative Teacher Education Program	35

INTRODUCTION

The Cooperative Teacher Education Program has completed three years of operation in S.A.D. #71, Kennebunk and Kennebunkport, Maine. The project was funded by Title III for this period. The project was designed to change education by changing the learning process in the training of future teachers. Seventy students from the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham have participated in the program. The University trainees were assigned to selected classroom teachers from S.A.D. #71 who became their tutors. Instructors from the University as well as personnel from the school district taught courses and seminars for the interns on site. Students received up to 30 college credit hours for the courses and teaching experience taken during the academic year. Students were allowed to try placements in different grade levels.

The general goals of the project were:

1. to bring about change in the present method of preparing teachers by the involvement of the teacher trainees completely in the learning process through their participation during the academic year in public school classrooms so that the trainees may blend educational theory with practice.
2. to bring about an exchange of ideas and knowledge between the public school practitioner and the University instructor in order that each group may renew the other.
3. to individualize further the learning situation for all pupils in the public school classrooms through the presence of additional personnel, i.e., the trainees.
4. to utilize better the resources of the University to the public schools by having the University directly involved in a cooperative project.
5. to break the cycle of passive learning by enabling the trainees to teach as they have learned.

The Context: School Administrative District #71

The town of Kennebunk and Kennebunkport are located in York County on the coast of Maine, midway between Portsmouth, New Hampshire and Portland, Maine. During the era of the great sailing vessels the two communities were famous for shipbuilding and world trade.

The rugged beauty of the Maine coast, the sandy beaches, a low population density, a close proximity to metropolitan Boston, and easy access to major ski areas have caused an "in-migration" of people from out of state, especially during the past decade. The nature of this population growth has caused the two communities to take on the typical characteristics of a suburban area.

Previous to 1948, both communities maintained their own elementary and secondary schools as part of the then traditional School Union system. During that year, Kennebunkport closed its high school and transported its secondary school pupils to Kennebunk. In 1968 the two communities were organized into Maine School Administrative District Number 71. The District's policies are formed by a ten-member Board of School Directors; six Directors from the Town of Kennebunk and four from the Town of Kennebunkport. There are five separate school facilities in the District.

There are one hundred and five classroom teachers; forty-two are assigned to the high school, and sixty-three to the elementary school. The school system also employs teacher aids, library aids, and teacher assistants.

The enrollment in the School District was 2,127; 1,477 elementary school pupils and 650 high school pupils during 1972-73, and 2,170; 1,495 elementary school pupils and 675 high school pupils during 1973-74.

The elementary schools in the District apply a variety of teaching styles at each level of instruction. The individual needs of the child permeate the total philosophy of the school. Hence, a considerable emphasis is placed upon individualizing the learning situation. Currently the teaching-learning process

in the elementary schools employs the concept of the integrated day, team teaching, activity-centered classrooms, and the non-graded experience.

The 1975 operating budget for six months for the District totaled \$1,149,417.

PERSONNEL

The Staff

The personnel who supported the program came from two sources, the S.A.D. #71 school system and the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham. The project directors came from both sources. One of the directors was from S.A.D. #71 Leo Martin was from the school system while Melissa Costello represented the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham. Leo G. Martin is Assistant Superintendent of S.A.D. #71 and principal of Park Street Elementary School. Melissa Costello is chairman of the department of elementary education at Portland-Gorham.

The roles of the S.A.D. #71 directors were to supervise and coordinate L.E.A. staff and university students as well as to help instruct the students, act as a liaison between the L.E.A. and university, and help administer the program. The university representative supervised and coordinated the university staff, and helped act as a liaison between the university and L.E.A. as well as working with the trainees and teachers.

During the 1974-75 school year twenty-nine classroom teachers were committed to the project to help train the students. Their role was to supervise the daily laboratory experiences of the students, to counsel them and to help them transcribe educational theory into practice.

PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN PROGRAM 1972 - 1975

A list of S.A.D. #71 personnel involved as well as the interns and University of Maine staff in the program for 1972-1975 follows.

1972-1973 Participating Interns in the Cooperative Teacher Education Program

Ted Axelson	Connie Pontbriand
Barbara Bell	Tom Prouty
Barbara Belyea	Donna Ramsdell
Paula Bresnahan	Dick Roberge
Lucille Brault	Betsy Seavey
Ed Bishop	Mary Shorey
Mark DeBlais	Nancy Smith
Joe Eragitano	Susan Sprague
Robert Jones	Joan Warren
Deborah Jordan	Janice Weatherbee
Diane Lachance	Chris Weir
Madeline Morin	Jane Wellman

S.A.D. #71 Administrators Participating in Cooperative Teacher Education Program

Arthur K. Hedberg, Jr., Superintendent of Schools
 Leo G. Martin - Co-Director of Project, Principal/Assistant Superintendent
 of Schools
 Daniel Calderwood, Principal Consolidated School
 Albert Meserve, Assistant Principal, Cousens School

UMPG Personnel Participating in Cooperative Teacher Education Program

Dean H. Philippi
 Dr. Bruce Allen
 James Bowen
 Melissa Costello, Co-Director of Project
 Reginald Fickett
 Dr. Hal Neuberger
 Dr. Gene Stearns

1973-1974 Participating Interns in the Cooperative Teacher Education Program

Charles Andre	Harry Grant
Daniel Baillargeon	Susan Hall
Diane Bires	Amy Hanson
David Bonney	Sandra Jawks
Ruth Browne	Edward Levine
Gary Brynes	Jacqueline McNabb
Julie Carmichael	Shirley O'Connell
Ruth Ellen Clark	Charles Pattershall
M. Theresa Cote	Marc Pelletier
Claire Doyon	Betty Rowan
Wendy Duncan	Jonathan Seaver
Shelia Gleason	Greg Schwabe
Virginia Gooch	Charles Sullivan
	Gregory Thornton

#71 Administrators Participating in Cooperative Teacher Education Program

Arthur K. Hedberg, Jr., Superintendent of Schools
 Leo G. Martin - Co-Director, Assist. Superintendent/Principal
 David Potter, Principal Consolidated School
 Shirley Grover, Principal of Kennebunk Jr. High

UMPG Personnel Participating in Cooperative Teacher Education Program 1973-74

Dean H. Philippi
 Dr. Bruce Allen
 James Bowen
 Melissa Costello, Co-Director of the Project
 Dr. Michael O'Donnel

1974-1975 Participating Interns in the Cooperative Teacher Education Program

James Baillargeon	Esther Forest
Julie Berry	Cheryl Gray
Marilyn Boudreau	Lois Higgins
Bonnie Lee Brown	Joanne Landry
James Brown	Thomas Lindsey
Elizabeth Cable	Susan Lolley
Janice Caron	Larry Murinson
Barbara Clark	Eleanor Pickel
Jane Finnell	Coleen Pike
	Deborah Warren

#71 Administrators Participating in Cooperative Teacher Education Program

Arthur K. Hedberg, Jr., Superintendent of Schools
 Leo G. Martin -Co-Director, Assist. Superintendent/Principal
 David Potter, Principal Consolidated School
 Shirley Grover, Principal of Kennebunk Jr. High
 Albert Meserve, Assistant Principal Cousens School

UMPG Personnel Participating in Cooperative Teacher Education Program

Dean H. Philippi
 Dr. B. Allen
 Melissa Costello, Co-Director of Project
 Dr. Hal Neuberger
 Dr. Gene Stearns
 Dr. B. Whiteside.
 Don Gnecco

MSAD #71 Teachers Participating in the Cooperative Teacher Education Program
 Teachers are listed in alphabetical order with dates of participation:

Clark Adams (1973-75)	Beverly Emerson (1972-75)	Ruth Nunan (1973-75)
Jane Anderson (1972-75)	Diane Emery (1972-74)	Madeline Ruel (1972-75)
Betty Bartley (1972-74)	Lorilee Ferserda (1972-75)	Linda Sherman (1973-74)
June Burbank (1972-75)	Eleanor Gould (1972-75)	Linda Skillin (1973-75)
Eve Burgess (1972-75)	Shirley Grover (1973-75)	Richard Smith (1972-75)
Elsie Byrne (1972-74)	Frances Gunn (1972-75)	Jacquelines Starace (1972-75)
Barbara Cluff (1972-75)	Richard Johnson (1973-75)	Collette Taylor (1972-75)
Ivan Cole (1972-75)	Drusilla Landry (1972-75)	Robert Towne (1972-75)
Rita Drew (1972-75)	Priscilla Martin (1972-75)	Charles Towne (1972-75)
Robert Dyer (1972-75)	Judith Merrow (1973-75)	Rhonda Warner (1973-75)
John Ellsworth (1972-75)	Karen Myrick (1972-75)	Charles Wormwood (1972-75)

THE INTERNS

Seventy interns, forty-seven women and 23 men, participated in the program during the three year period. The mean verbal and quantitative scores for the group on the SAT were approximately 500. Their grade point average ranged from 2.1 to 3.9 with a median rating of 3.1.

PROGRAM

Four courses each semester were usually offered on site for the interns to take. The first semester of the 1974-75 school year Methods of Teaching Science; Methods of Teaching Mathematics and Teaching of Reading were taught. The Elementary Curriculum, Human Growth and Development, Children's Literature and Seminar for Student teachers were presented the spring term. Descriptions of courses can be found in the 1973-74 Summative Report. Three of the courses were taught by S.A.D. #71 personnel. The Mathematics and Science Methods courses were combined and team taught by two UMPG professors.

OBJECTIVE 1 - Achievement of Students

The first objective related to the achievement of students in classrooms with interns as compared with those without interns. The Stanford Achievement Test (1972 edition) was administered by the district to all students in Grade 1 to Grade 6 during May, 1975. A post test only control group design was utilized to compare the responses of the two groups on the achievement tests by grade. The results of this comparison are presented in Table 1. Significant differences between the means of the group were found at the second, third and fourth grade level. The differences were in favor of the non project classrooms at the second and fourth grade level and project classrooms at the third grade level. The differences follow a random pattern and are partially explained by the differences in the entry behavior of the students rather than due to the presence or absence of an intern.

During the 1973-74 school year no significant differences were found between the achievement of students in classrooms staffed by interns and cooperating teachers and those taught by regular teachers.

TABLE 1

Comparison of the Means of the Sub Scales & Battery Totals
on the Stanford Achievement Test
for Project and Non Project Students Grades 1-6

Scale	Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6	
	P	NP	P(59)	NP(58)	P(62)	NP(59)	P(90)	NP(107)	P(82)	NP(83)	P(86)	NP(106)
Vocabulary	2.7	2.8	3.7	4.0	4.7	4.5	5.1	5.7*	7.2	7.0	8.0	7.5
Reading												
Comp. A	2.3	2.5	3.5	3.6								
B	2.5	2.6	3.6	3.9								
Reading Comp	2.6	2.9	3.6	3.8	4.5	4.0	5.6	5.8	7.4	7.7	8.4	8.3
Word Study												
Skills	2.9	3.3	4.1	4.3	5.1	5.0	5.6	6.1	7.5	7.3	8.4	7.9
Mathematics												
Concepts	2.8	2.5	3.3	3.7*	4.7	4.0*	5.2	5.6	6.9	6.8	8.0	7.4
Comp	2.6	2.6	3.1	3.0	3.9	3.7	5.5	5.9	7.0	6.7	8.1	7.7
Applic.			3.4	3.9*	4.6	4.2	5.3	5.9*	7.0	6.8	8.2	7.6
Spelling			3.3	3.3	4.3	4.0	4.8	5.5*	6.6	6.8	7.9	7.4
Language					4.1	3.7	5.4	5.8	7.2	7.5	8.6	8.2
Soc. Science			3.5	3.8	4.4	4.0	4.9	5.4	7.0	7.1	8.4	8.0
Soc. St.-Science												
Science			3.5	3.9	4.2	4.0	5.1	5.5	6.9	7.0	8.1	8.0
Listening	2.9	2.9	3.4	3.8	4.9	4.5	4.8	5.3	7.1	6.9	8.5	8.1
Total Bat.	2.6	2.8	3.4	3.6	4.3	4.0	5.1	5.6*	7.1	7.0	8.3	7.9
Total Aud.	2.7	2.8	3.5	3.8	4.7	4.4	4.9	5.4*	6.9	6.7	7.9	7.4
Total Read.	2.8	3.1	3.8	4.0	4.7	4.3	5.5	6.0	7.4	7.6	8.4	8.2
Total Math.	2.7	2.6	3.2	3.4	4.3	3.9*	5.4	5.9	6.9	6.7	8.2	7.7

OBJECTIVE 2 - Attitude toward School

The second objective was concerned with the attitude of students in classrooms with interns as compared with those without interns. A forty item attitude scale was developed by the project staff. A post test only control group design was utilized to compare the responses for the two groups by grades 1-6 and then by the total group of project and non project students from grades 1-8. The results of this comparison for 1974-75 school year are presented in Table 2. Students responded anonymously to this questionnaire. They were asked to respond to each item on a four point scale: 1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=a lot and 4=always.

There were significant differences on seven items for the first grade sample. More children in project classrooms liked reading, felt grown-ups paid attention to them in school, were allowed to cook at home, would prefer to have more than one grown-up in their classroom than in non project classrooms. More children in non project classrooms stated they ate their breakfast and were less afraid of men and women than children in project classrooms.

At the second grade level there were six items with significant differences between students in project classrooms and children in non project classrooms. Students in project classrooms liked to sing, liked to do jobs for the teachers, play with other children at recess than students in non project classrooms. The latter scored higher means on liking to cook, in liking social studies, and not wishing more help with their work.

There were nine items with significant differences between the group on the third grade level. Students in project classes showed greater liking of math and social studies and school, singing and dancing, and playing with other children at recess as well as doing jobs for the teachers and eating most of their lunch than children in non project classrooms. Pupils in non project classrooms showed greater preference to Saturdays and Sundays as their favorite days.

Eleven items were significant at the fourth grade level. Pupils in project classrooms liked school more, felt teachers understood them more, liked math, liked to dance more than those in non project classrooms. The non project students gave higher ratings to liking reading, art, getting along well with other kids, eating breakfast, having Saturday and Sunday as their favorite days and being afraid of women.

There were significant differences on 8 items for the fifth grade sample. Project students liked school more than non project students, felt grown-ups were paying attention to them in school, liked social studies, art, cooking and liked to do jobs for the teachers. Non project pupils reported they ate most of their lunch more as well as biting their finger nails less than project students.

At the sixth grade level, there were five items with significant differences between the project and non-project students. Project students liked school as well as mathematics, and felt that grown-ups talked with them, liked school better than home and liked to do jobs for teachers more than the non-project students.

Overall, pupils from project classrooms rated they liked school more than the non-project pupils. In 4 of the 6 grades tested there were significant differences between the ratings of the two groups. Also when the total group of project and non project students are combined, the difference is significant at the .01 level.

Ratings on liking mathematics were significant for three of the grades and for the combined group. The same applies for liking social studies.

Pupils from project classrooms liked to do jobs for teachers. There were significant differences for four grades and the combined groups in favor of project students.

When the total groups are combined, project students rate significantly higher that grown-ups pay attention to them in school, that their teachers understand them, that grown-ups talk with them, that they like school better than home, that grown-ups are trying to help them and that they like to have more than one grown-up in their classroom than non project students.

In summary there appears to be a significantly more positive attitude toward school and most school subjects and about adults in the classroom and school environment by students who are in project classrooms.

The results follow the patterns found with the 1973-74 and 1972-73 students. Project students tended to be more positive in their responses to the items related to adult relationships as well as those related to liking school and school subjects.

TABLE 2 ITEM STATEMENTS

1. I LIKE SCHOOL.
2. GROWN-UPS PAY ATTENTION TO ME IN SCHOOL.
3. MY TEACHERS UNDERSTAND ME.
4. I LIKE READING.
5. I LIKE SCIENCE.
6. I LIKE MATH.
7. I LIKE SOCIAL STUDIES.
8. I LIKE ART.
9. I LIKE PLAYGROUND.
10. GROWN-UPS TALK WITH ME.
11. I LIKE SCHOOL BETTER THAN HOME.
12. I GET ALONG WELL WITH THE OTHER KIDS.
13. I UNDERSTAND MY SCHOOL WORK.
14. I LIKE TO PLAY SPORTS.
15. I LIKE TO SING.
16. I LIKE TO DANCE.
17. I LIKE TO COOK.
18. I AM ALLOWED TO COOK.
19. I EAT BREAKFAST.
20. I EAT MOST OF MY LUNCH.
21. I PLAY WITH OTHER CHILDREN AT RECESS.
22. I LIKE TO DO JOBS FOR THE TEACHERS.
23. I THINK GROWN-UPS ARE TRYING TO HELP ME.
24. I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE MORE THAN ONE GROWN-UP IN MY ROOM.
25. I WORRY IN SCHOOL.

26. SATURDAY AND SUNDAY ARE MY FAVORITE DAYS.
27. MY STOMACH FEELS FUNNY IN SCHOOL.
28. I FEEL LIKE CRYING IN SCHOOL.
29. I AM AFRAID IN SCHOOL.
30. I BITE MY FINDERNAIJS IN SCHOOL.
31. I WISH I HAD MORE HELP WITH MY WORK.
32. I WISH SOMEONE WOULD LISTEN TO ME.
33. IN SCHOOL I DAY DREAM.
34. I AM AFRAID OF GROWN-UPS.
35. I AM AFRAID OF CHILDREN.
36. I AM AFRAID OF WOMEN.
37. I AM AFRAID OF MEN.
38. I AM AFRAID TO GO TO THE STORE.
39. I OVERSLEEP IN THE MORNING.
40. I GET CONFUSED BY HAVING MORE THAN ONE GROWN-UP IN MY ROOM.

TABLE 2
Comparison of the Means of Grade 1-8 Students
on the Attitude Toward School Scale

ITEM	GRADE													
	1		2		3		4		5		6		1-8	
	P (62)	NP (58)	P (104)	NP (33)	P (56)	NP (39)	P (78)	NP (73)	P (60)	NP (102)	P (83)	NP (94)	P (444)	NP (506)
1	3.25	3.08	2.54	2.75	2.41	1.94**	2.88	2.50*	2.68	2.28**	2.41	2.10**	2.68	2.37**
2	3.21	2.70*	2.45	2.37	2.42	2.35	2.72	2.52	2.68	2.16**	2.39	2.30	2.61	2.34**
3	3.18	3.20	2.93	2.66	2.76	2.74	2.97	2.64*	2.71	2.43*	2.43	2.32	2.82	2.53**
4	3.32	2.91*	3.13	3.06	3.03	2.76	2.75	3.17*	2.75	2.69	2.40	2.56	2.88	2.79
5	3.17	2.98	3.06	2.80	2.91	2.94	2.56	2.83	2.56	2.76	2.60	2.30	2.81	2.71
6	2.68	2.84	2.84	2.50	2.85	2.36*	3.15	2.73*	2.65	2.45	2.61	2.19**	2.80	2.38**
7	2.98	2.65	2.50	2.93*	2.61	1.94**	2.81	2.77	2.66	2.28*	2.38	2.27	2.63	2.39**
8	3.53	3.48	3.07	3.09	3.26	2.94	3.11	3.50*	3.45	3.16*	3.06	2.98	3.21	3.00**
9	3.56	3.65	3.38	3.12	3.48	3.74	3.39	3.52	3.36	3.40	3.61	3.47	3.46	3.43
10	2.91	2.67	2.26	2.33	2.50	2.28	2.71	2.71	2.48	2.35	2.50	2.31*	2.53	2.40**
11	2.44	2.21	1.88	1.64	1.60	1.37	1.81	1.76	1.66	1.51	1.61	1.32**	1.83	1.60**
12	3.04	2.96	2.52	2.81	2.79	2.48	2.65	2.93*	2.68	2.79	2.90	2.87	2.74	2.83
13	2.75	3.05	2.55	2.40	2.50	2.51	2.77	2.60	2.73	2.59	2.66	2.57	2.65	2.59
14	2.91	3.26	3.11	3.00	3.50	3.30	3.42	3.47	3.38	3.43	3.38	3.17	3.27	3.26

TABLE 2 continued

ITEM	GRADE													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1-8							
	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
15	3.16	2.80	2.74	2.27*	2.46	1.76**	2.73	2.69	2.50	2.74	2.60	2.47	2.70	2.52**
16	2.22	2.18	1.84	2.09	1.78	1.36*	2.15	1.77*	2.17	2.13	2.20	2.21	2.05	2.21*
17	3.09	2.70	2.79	3.25*	2.87	3.00	3.10	3.00	3.20	2.76*	2.68	2.77	2.93	2.82
18	2.59	2.13*	2.06	2.30	2.36	2.31	2.32	2.41	2.71	2.51	2.74	2.73	2.43	2.54
19	3.18	3.63*	3.51	3.20	3.41	3.36	2.90	3.64*	3.21	3.32	3.39	3.29	3.28	3.34
20	3.17	3.17	2.97	3.03	3.16	2.57*	3.26	3.00	2.87	3.18*	2.91	3.10	3.05	3.06
21	3.03	3.05	3.28	2.46**	3.32	2.55**	3.18	3.42	3.31	3.43	3.39	3.27	3.22	3.18
22	3.32	3.21	3.28	2.46	3.23	2.78*	3.22	3.10	3.51	2.95**	3.10	2.69**	3.27	2.72**
23	3.32	3.21	3.14	3.12	3.21	2.89	3.14	2.88	3.01	2.74	2.73	2.66	3.07	2.78**
24	2.96	2.43*	2.76	2.37	2.85	2.52	2.57	2.60	3.08	2.79	2.57	2.44	2.77	2.47**
25	2.12	1.80	1.86	1.80	1.56	1.60	1.74	1.92	1.77	1.88	1.83	1.84	1.73	1.74
26	3.48	3.32	3.26	3.19	3.07	3.73**	2.80	3.16*	2.94	2.93	2.98	3.03	3.08	3.12
27	2.09	2.00	1.74	1.75	1.72	1.71	1.81	1.77	1.77	1.75	1.48	1.59	1.75	1.73
28	1.53	1.31	1.48	1.59	1.23	1.21	1.51	1.54	1.44	1.35	1.30	1.30	1.42	1.36
29	1.26	1.12	1.31	1.31	1.20	1.15	1.36	1.38	1.29	1.25	1.32	1.32	1.30	1.27
30	1.44	1.56	1.48	1.60	1.50	1.65	1.53	1.76	1.68	1.41*	1.78	1.68	1.57	1.62

TABLE 2 continued

ITEM	GRADE													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1-8							
	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
31	2.31	2.43	2.42	1.87*	2.08	2.30	1.92	2.02*	2.08	2.15	2.13	2.23	2.17	2.22
32	2.80	2.62	2.55	2.28	2.50	2.25	2.38	2.36	2.30	2.37	2.34	2.33	2.47	2.33*
33	1.83	1.70	1.68	1.72	1.94	1.69	1.92	1.84	1.81	1.81	1.97	2.03	1.85	1.94
34	1.45	1.24	1.36	1.31	1.33	1.23	1.37	1.48	1.31	1.33	1.38	1.38	1.29	1.26
35	1.24	1.06*	1.26	1.21	1.23	1.34	1.40	1.46	1.30	1.34	1.30	1.18	1.22	1.25
36	1.27	1.15	1.25	1.25	1.23	1.28	1.21	1.38*	1.15	1.22	1.21	1.21	1.29	1.29
37	1.46	1.20*	1.60	1.37	1.39	1.43	1.48	1.65	1.53	1.40	1.44	1.54	1.49	1.45
38	1.25	1.14	1.31	1.06	1.08	1.07	1.20	1.08	1.16	1.12	1.05	1.07	1.18	1.11
39	2.27	2.06	2.25	2.03	2.12	2.30	2.08	1.95	1.86	1.93	1.95	1.89	2.10	2.03
40	1.73	1.53	1.61	1.62	1.41	1.56	1.40	1.42	1.16	1.26	1.38	1.48	1.46	1.45

*p 05

**p 01

OBJECTIVE 3 - Achievement of Cognitive Objectives by Interns

A pre test - post test design was used to check whether the teacher trainees were able by the end of the year to identify practical applications of non gradedness, team teaching, individualizing, instructional television, the integrated day, differentiated staffing, learning disabilities programs, environmental education and basic methods of teaching reading, mathematics, science, social studies, penmanship, language arts, music, art and physical education. They were also expected to be able to identify and describe salient parts of Burmer's Man: A Course of Studies (social studies program) and the steps in establishing a drug abuse education program.

As in the previous two years of the project, ninety per cent or more of 1974-75 trainees at the end of the year could

1. describe two specific ways in which a teacher uses non gradedness in a classroom.
2. describe three specific ways in which a teacher participates in team teaching practices.
3. describe three specific means of individualizing the learning program for a child.
4. give three values and practical applications of television in the classroom.
5. describe the pupil's role, teacher's role and the presentation of subjects/skill matter in the integrated day.
6. list the typical hierarchy of differentiated staffing.
7. list five common learning disabilities and give a very brief description for each.
8. list three ways in which an environmental education program is correlated into a classroom program.
9. describe the purpose of the units on Gulls, Salmon, Baboons, Eskimos in Burmer's Man: A Course of Study.

10. list six sequential concepts presented in a drug abuse program for elementary school pupils.
11. list five specific reading skills taught in the elementary schools and give practical applications of teaching them.
12. list three practical means of teaching arithmetic computation; three of arithmetic concepts, and also arithmetic applications.
13. describe three means of teaching science involving pupils directly.
14. explain three practical applications of social studies.
15. give three practical ways of teaching penmanship.
16. describe four ways of correlating language arts with other subjects.
17. identify five ways of presenting music to elementary school pupils.
18. present five practical art lessons.
19. list five practical methods of accomplishing the purposes of an elementary physical education program.

OBJECTIVE 4 - Teacher Attitudes

Teacher attitudes toward self-growth and teaching practices were measured by a sixteen item survey form. A post test only control group design was used to compare the responses of project and non project teachers to the items. They were asked to respond to each question on a five point scale (always, usually, occasionally, seldom or never).

No significant differences were found between the responses of the project and non project teachers during the 1974-75 school year. The means for the 1974-75 staff are presented in Table 3.

Results from previous years indicated that project teachers were better able to individualize and give diagnostic attention and provide diverse activities for students. The cooperating teachers gave indication that they were more comfortable with the interns and were better able to utilize them effectively. The cooperating teachers became more critical of their teaching practices and tended to look critically at their instructional patterns.

The differences between the two groups of teachers has narrowed during the third year of the project. The non project teachers tend to be closer in their responses to the project teachers. This trend appears to be an indication that the school climate has become either through administrative guidance or through project activities one of more cooperation and sharing and utilization of resources.

TABLE 3
Comparison on Means of Items
of Project and Non-project Teachers
on Teacher Survey Form

#	ITEM	PROJECT (20)	NON-PROJECT (18)	
1	How often are you able to provide the individual help each child in your class needs?	2.900	2.666	NS
2	How often have you been able to have conferences with the specialists in learning disabilities, speech, reading, etc.?	3.250	2.944	NS
3	How often have you been able to follow-up effectively the work done by these specialists?	3.000	2.777	NS
4	How often do you go home feeling you have not accomplished your goals for the day?	1.850	1.833	NS
5	How often do you have time to "listen" to your students?	2.950	3.000	NS
6	How often have you been unable to contact immediately a parent, the principal or another teacher about a problem because you couldn't leave the class for the 10 or 15 minutes such contacts take?	1.555	2.076	NS
7	How often do you go home excited about what happened in your classroom?	2.650	2.555	NS
8	How often do you go home feeling you profited from some teaching you saw someone else do?	1.950	1.888	NS
9	How often have you been free to visit another teacher's class?	1.894	1.733	NS
10	How often are supplementary teaching materials used in your classroom?	3.750	3.000	NS

TABLE 3 continued

#	ITEM	PROJECT	NON-PROJECT	
11	How often have you been able to give diagnostic attention to the individual child & the specific activity in which he is involved before changing, extending or re-directing his activity?	2.850	2.500	NS
12	How often have you been able to regroup students along interest lines?	2.900	2.882	NS
13	How often have you been able to take one group of students out of the room for an activity while at the same time, knowing the rest had proper instruction and supervision?	2.600	2.066	NS
14	How often do you feel individual students' non-academic problems have been given adequate attention?	2.650	2.764	NS
15	How often do you feel the children have been in a positive learning situation without you being the center of attention?	2.700	2.470	NS
16	How often were you able to have several constructive activities going on in your room simultaneously?	3.050	2.647	NS

OBJECTIVE 5 - Performance of Interns

The fifth objective related to the successful performance of the interns in their student teaching. The ratings of the interns by the cooperating teachers on the University of Maine Portland-Gorham form is presented in Table 4. The teachers rated dimensions of the students' professional outlook, personal qualities and teaching skills on a five point scale ranging from excellent to unsatisfactory. Overall the ratings are skewed toward the high end of the scale. About three fourths of the students were rated excellent about on all the dimensions. Only one student was rated average and poor on the dimensions of the scale.

The ratings given to the 1974-75 interns correspond to those received by the 1973-74 group.

TABLE 4

Ratings of Interns by Cooperating Teachers
On the University of Maine-Portland-Gorham Form

CATEGORY	END OF YEAR					N=16
	EX	VG	AV	POOR	US	
<u>Professional Outlook</u>						
1. Shows positive attitude toward profession	13	2	1	0	0	
2. Evidences interest in professional improvement	12	3	1	0	0	
3. Participates in school activities	9	6	0	1	0	
4. Cooperates with faculty, staff & administration	13	3	0	0	0	
5. Shows enthusiasm for teaching	13	2	0	1	0	
<u>Personal Qualities</u>						
1. Evidences social & emotional maturity	12	3	1	0	0	
2. Accepts constructive suggestions & acts upon them	12	4	0	0	0	
3. Takes initiative & assumes responsibility	13	3	0	0	0	
4. Shows flexibility in relationships with others	12	4	0	0	0	
5. Meets obligations promptly & is punctual	11	5	0	0	0	
6. Speaks & writes effectively	12	3	1	0	0	
7. Dresses appropriately & is well groomed	13	3	0	0	0	
<u>Subject Matter Knowledge</u>						
1. Evidences an understanding of appropriate subject matter	11	4	1	0	0	
2. Applies understanding of subject matter to teaching activities	10	6	0	0	0	

TABLE 4 continued

CATEGORY	END OF YEAR				
	EX	VG	AV	POOR	US
<u>Teaching Skills</u>					
1. Plans effectively both short range & unit plans	9	6	1	0	0
2. Assumes leadership in directing pupil activities	9	7	0	0	0
3. Shows resourcefulness, creativity & desirable individuality	10	5	1	0	0
4. Indicates growth in ability to organize & manage classroom activities	10	5	1	0	0
5. Involves pupils actively & intensively in learning activities	9	6	1	0	0
6. Uses developmental methods which included discovery, inquiry & understanding	7	8	1	0	0
7. Maintains effective discipline and works toward developing pupil self-control	10	5	1	0	0
8. Uses a wide variety of instructional materials	8	8	0	0	0
9. Understands & uses evaluation techniques for diagnostic & measurement purposes	7	8	1	0	0
10. Shows concern for appropriate physical environment	8	6	2	0	0

Ratings of Courses Taken by Interns 1972-1975

The mean ratings of courses taken by the three groups of interns involved in the program at the end of each academic year and the follow-up group of 21 of the 1972-74 interns is presented in Table 5. A forty-five item questionnaire was completed by the interns. They were asked to rate each course as to how helpful it was in preparing them for teaching. The courses were rated on a five point scale ranging from having "no value" to having "tremendous value."

The experience having the greatest value to the interns from all four samples was the "Junior Year Internship." All but two students from the total group rated it "5" or "having tremendous value."

Courses taught at the site tended to have the highest ratings of the professional education courses taken by the students. Some of these courses were Children's Literature, Methods of Teaching Science, Methods of Teaching Reading and Methods of Teaching Mathematics.

Children's Literature tended to have the highest rating by the interns of any of the methods courses after the first year of the program, when it was taught by a staff member of the S.A.D.

Liberal arts courses, except for Mathematics, were rated lower than the methods courses. The introductory education courses were rated of little value except for the pre-professional experience.

TABLE 5

Mean Ratings of Courses Taken by Trainees
As to How Helpful the Courses Were
in Preparing Them for Teaching

COURSE	MEANS			
	1973	INTERNS 1974	1975	FOLLOW-UP 1972-74
1 Composition	2.80	3.07	2.75	2.90
2 Introduction to Lit.	3.06	3.00	2.85	2.66
3 Topics in Literature	2.58	3.15	3.00	2.27
4 Modern Languages	3.75	2.75	3.00	3.32
5 Philosophy	2.86	3.12	3.00	3.40
6 Art	2.33	2.80	3.66	3.50
7 Music	2.62	2.82	2.60	2.53
8 Theater	4.00	2.33	2.00	2.83
9 Speech	3.25	2.66	3.75	3.75
10 Physical Science	2.95	2.81	3.62	3.23
11 Biological Science	2.13	3.00	3.75	3.18
12 Mathematics	3.55	3.47	4.25	4.15
13 Psychology	3.11	3.28	3.71	3.14
14 Child Psychology	3.28	3.33	4.00	3.28
15 Adolescent Psychology	2.33	3.50	3.50	4.00
16 Educational Psychology	1.00	3.25	4.50	3.75
17 Political Science	2.25	2.40	2.33	2.33
18 Sociology	2.78	3.15	3.55	2.73
19 Economics	1.50	2.11	2.33	2.33
20 American School	2.50	2.44	2.25	2.05

TABLE 5 continued

COURSE	MEANS			
	1973	INTERNS 1974	1975	FOLLOW-UP 1972-74
21 Philosophy of Education	2.33	2.83	1.50	2.28
22 History of Education	1.67	3.14	2.50	1.50
23 Curriculum	4.05	4.05	3.90	3.75
24 Teaching of Reading	4.65	4.16	4.40	4.04
25 Teaching of Mathematics	4.24	3.90	4.50	4.38
26 Teaching of Science	4.04	4.09	4.33	4.11
27 Children's Literature	3.91	4.57	4.80	4.60
28 Teaching of Art	3.50	4.20	4.50	4.50
29 Teaching of Music	3.67	3.33	3.66	3.42
30 Teaching of Physical Ed.		4.25		4.50
31 Teaching of Soc. Stud.		3.00		3.33
32 Teaching Process		2.75	3.00	3.50
33 Measurement & Evaluation	2.53	3.05	2.50	2.22
34 Human Growth & Develop.	2.81	2.76	3.70	2.47
35 Physical Education	2.72	2.66	2.55	3.21
36 Pre-profess. Experience	4.70	4.11	4.66	4.37
37 Student Teaching	5.00	4.53	5.00	4.75
38 Jr. Year Internship	5.00	4.90	5.00	4.95
39 Independent Study	4.71	3.83	4.25	3.76
40 Audio-Visual Aids	4.17	3.71	4.50	4.42
41 Western Civilization	2.07	3.00	3.00	2.41
42 American History	3.17	2.70	2.62	3.36

TABLE 5 continued

COURSE	MEANS			
	1973	INTERNS 1974	1975	FOLLOW-UP 1972-74
43 Your Academic Field	4.57	3.25	3.40	4.06
44 Diagnostic & Remedial Reading	4.57	3.25		4.00
45 Learning Disabilities	4.00	3.60		4.40

Attitudes and Perceptions of Staff and Interns to the Cooperative Teacher Education Program

A 44 item scale was developed to measure the attitudes and perceptions of interns as well as project staff to the Cooperative Teacher Education Program 1972-75. Two thirds of the teachers and administrators involved in the program responded to the questionnaire, all the 1974-75 interns, and approximately 50% of the interns who graduated from the program. The scale was a five point scale ranging from (5) strongly agree to (1) strongly disagree. The comparison of the mean responses of the three groups are presented in Table 6.

There were significant mean differences in the perceptions of the three groups on eleven of the 44 items. The 1974-75 interns felt they knew the proper channels to go through better than the 1972-74 interns. Both groups of interns felt more strongly that their training prepared them better for teaching than did the group of cooperating teachers and administrators. However, all groups strongly agreed with the value of the program.

The interns felt they were as committed to teaching as the student teachers from traditional programs more strongly than did the teachers and administrators. The interns were considered to be very professional.

Both groups of interns tended to rate the liaison between school and university less smoothly and efficiently than did the project staff. The interns felt their course experiences were related to their classroom experiences more than the project staff did.

The interns had a higher self evaluation of their teaching skills than did the project staff. All groups rated skills high.

Interns felt that they involved their pupils in decision making more than the staff did.

The interns felt that the University failed to exhibit effective instructional leadership much more than the project teachers.

The previous interns felt more strongly than the other two groups that the internship should extend over more years of the student's program. This group after facing the real job market were not as strong in their feeling that graduates of the program will be more successful teaching than those from traditional teacher education programs. Also they felt that community involvement was not as effectively included in the program as did the current interns and project staff.

The interns felt the project was more cost effective than did the cooperating teachers and administrators.

Overall the current interns agreed most strongly to the following item:

1. Teaching competencies can be better learned in the public schools than in the college classroom. (M=4.85)
2. The interns were better prepared for teaching than students going through the traditional programs. (M=4.85)
3. The intership should be a part of all teacher education programs. (M=4.70)
4. The interns were able to demonstrate adequate teaching skills. (M=4.60)
5. The program was a growth learning experience on the part of all groups involved. (M=4.60)

The 1972-74 interns agreed most strongly to the following five items:

1. The interns were better prepared for teaching than students going through the traditional teacher training programs. (M=4.95)
2. The internship should be a part of all teacher education programs. (M=4.91)
3. Teaching competencies can be better learned in the public schools than in the college classroom. (M=4.75)
4. The program was a growth learning experience on the part of all groups involved. (M=4.58)
5. The interns were able to demonstrate adequate teaching skills. (M=4.50)

The teachers and administrators agreed most strongly to the following five items:

1. The internship should be a part of all teacher education programs.
(M=4.62)
2. Teaching competencies can be better learned in the public school than in the college classroom. (M=4.62)
3. Graduates of the program will be more successful in teaching than those graduates from traditional teacher education programs. (M=4.54)
4. The program was a growth learning experience on the part of all groups involved. (M=4.45)
5. The principals helped facilitate the success of the program. (M=4.45)

TABLE 6

Comparison of the means of Interns of 1974-75,
Previous Interns (1972-74) and Project Staff
to Perceptions of the Cooperative Teacher Education Program

ITEM	INTERNS 74-75 (20)	INTERNS 72-74 (24)	STAFF (24)	F
1 There was effective communication between interns, cooperating teachers, school administrators and staff at the University of Maine Portland-Gorham.	3.35	3.04	3.70	1.80
2 If an intern had a problem, he knew the proper channels to go through.	4.20	3.45	3.91	3.21*
3 The chain of command was clearly understood by cooperating teachers, interns, principals and college personnel.	3.55	3.26	3.91	2.35
4 The administrative staff for the Title III project demonstrated effective leadership for the program.	4.15	3.75	4.29	2.44
5 The interns were <u>not</u> very responsible members of the school program.	1.25	1.29	1.58	1.28
6 The interns were better prepared for teaching than students going through the traditional teacher training programs.	4.85	4.95	4.37	8.65**
7 The interns were very professional.	4.45	4.16	4.25	1.19
8 The interns were <u>not</u> as committed to teaching as students in more traditional programs.	1.20	1.16	1.79	4.89*
9 The liaison between school and university did <u>not</u> operate smoothly and efficiently.	2.90	3.33	2.25	8.32**
10 The teachers and supervisors provided honest and straight forward evaluation to the interns.	4.25	3.91	4.12	1.02
11 Course experiences offered at the center on the whole were <u>not</u> related to classroom experiences.	1.40	1.78	2.16	4.89*
12 Instructors who offered courses at the center geared their instruction to the needs of the trainees.	4.25	3.86	3.66	2.25

TABLE 6 continued

ITEM	INTERNS		STAFF (24)	F
	74-75 (20)	72-74 (24)		
13 The principals helped facilitate the success of the program.	4.45	4.29	4.45	0.40
14 The interns were able to demonstrate adequate teaching skills.	4.60	4.50	4.20	4.13*
15 Cooperating Teachers facilitated communications between interns and school staff.	3.95	3.83	4.12	0.82
16 The cooperating teachers provided adequate models of teaching skills.	4.40	4.37	4.12	1.28
17 The evaluation of the cooperating teachers of the intern was effectively communicated to the interns as well as college supervisors.	3.60	3.58	3.75	0.29
18 The evaluation of the cooperating teachers was valuable in modifying the interns teaching behavior.	3.85	3.91	3.91	0.05
19 The evaluation feedback from the principals to the interns was an effective component of the program.	3.65	3.37	3.91	2.20
20 Cooperating teachers had more effect on modifying interns' teaching skills than courses taken by the interns.	4.05	4.21	3.83	1.39
21 The feedback from the interns was utilized to modify the program.	3.95	3.91	4.00	0.07
22 The Cooperative Teacher Education program was able to structure the academic program for the trainees so that maximum transfer took place in the classroom.	3.89	3.91	4.08	0.44
23 There was little effort made by the staff to guide interns to identify and nurture the individuality of children.	1.50	1.87	1.47	1.63
24 The pupils taught by the interns were involved in the decision making and aware of the skills required for their educational programs.	4.15	3.33	3.66	7.14**
25 The evaluation process in the program led to effective learning on the part of the interns.	3.85	3.83	3.83	0.00

TABLE 6 continued

ITEM	INTERNS 74-75 (20)	INTERNS 72-74 (24)	STAFF (24)	F
26 All participating groups (teachers, interns, school administrators, college staff, etc.) were given the opportunity to participate in the identification of general and specific goals and priorities of the program.	4.15	3.62	3.91	1.84
27 The faculty at Portland-Gorham was encouraged to become actively involved in the program.	3.35	3.62	3.75	1.37
28 All participating groups were asked to evaluate the various phases and activities of the program.	3.85	4.17	4.08	1.19
29 Interns were guided to develop their own unique styles of teaching after minimal competencies were accomplished.	4.10	4.20	4.20	0.16
30 The interns did <u>not</u> have an adequate voice in the administration and functioning of the program.	2.30	2.12	1.95	0.83
31 The program was a growth learning experience on the part of all groups involved.	4.60	4.58	4.45	0.44
32 Insufficient feedback was available regarding the performance of the interns.	2.20	2.50	2.41	0.61
33 The standards set for the interns was <u>not</u> as high as for students in the regular teacher training program.	1.40	1.62	1.87	1.64
34 Community participation and involvement was effectively included in the program.	3.60	2.91	3.78	4.99*
35 The Portland-Gorham staff exhibited effective instructional leadership in the program.	3.75	2.95	4.25	11.95**
36 The project was <u>not</u> cost effective.	2.25	2.69	3.00	4.42*
37 The cost of the program would prevent other institutions and districts from trying such a program.	2.55	2.20	2.29	0.96
38 The internship should be a part of all teacher education programs.	4.70	4.91	4.62	1.80

TABLE 6 continued

ITEM	INTERNS 74-75 (20)	INTERNS 72-74 (24)	STAFF (24)	F
39 The internship should be placed later in the student's program.	1.95	2.12	1.79	0.73
40 The internship should extend over more years of the student's program.	2.50	3.41	2.62	4.08*
41 Teaching competencies can be better learned in the public schools than in the college classroom.	4.85	4.75	4.62	0.88
42 Graduates of the program will be more successful in teaching than those graduates from traditional teacher education programs.	4.50	4.00	4.54	3.22*
43 More of the courses and teaching methods should be taught by local school staff members than by college personnel.	3.25	3.33	3.16	0.17
44 Most college professors do not have a good idea what is going on in the schools today.	2.90	3.37	3.13	1.36

Follow-up Information on the 1972-74 Interns

A questionnaire was sent to the 51 students who participated in the program from 1972-74. Twenty-six of the 51 students responded or approximately 50% of the group. About one third of the group were currently holding teaching positions and one third were finishing their course work since they participated in the program as juniors. The bulk of the remaining students were working in service related occupations, as waitresses, nurses aids, waiters, and hotel clerks. A few were working in clerical and sales areas, as cashiers, clerks, and sales personnel.

The bulk of the students got the jobs "on their own." The three major reasons for their taking their current jobs were 1. the job was just what they wanted, 2. they needed the money and 3. it was the only decent job available. Those not finding teaching jobs gave the second and third answers.

For those finding teaching the primary two reasons given for their getting jobs were their educational background and past work experience. For those not entering teaching "personality" was the most important reason for their getting the job. A quarter of the group reported it was very easy to get their present job while a quarter reported it was very difficult.

Of those not finding jobs in teaching over seventy five percent felt that the college and teachers were of "no help" and sometimes a "hinderance" in preparing them for the world of work. Of those going into teaching, the group felt that college and teachers had been very helpful in preparing them for the world of work.

Again those working outside of teaching or not working felt that their college program of study was of no value in preparing them for their present job while those working as teachers felt their college program prepared them adequately for their job.

Those teaching said they wanted to remain in their present job or a job in the same area but a higher level job. Three quarters of those not teaching hoped to get a job in teaching in the future. A quarter of this group said they were going to change job fields.

Half of the group not employed in teaching when asked if they were beginning over, they would not take the same college program. All those employed as teachers said they would choose the same major.

Summative Evaluation of the Cooperative Teacher Education Program by Interns, Cooperating Staff Members, and College Personnel.

A questionnaire was given to all groups involved in the program and the respondents asked to answer anonymously the questions asked.

I. The first question asked concerned aspects of the program that worked effectively and should be implemented in similar programs. The suggestions are placed in rank order with the suggestions appearing most often ranked the highest.

Interns 1974-75

1. On site courses coordinated with school experiences.
2. Involvement of trainees in all phases of the school program including special services.
3. Experiences for interns provided on different levels, rather than on just one grade level.
4. Seminar for discussing student teaching problems.
5. Use of local school staff to teach some of the required courses on site.
6. Orientation sessions for interns starting the program.
7. Use of check list of experiences for interns to follow.

8. Involvement of students in choosing their placements.
9. Acceptance of interns as equals in the instructional team.

Previous interns (1972-74)

1. One site courses coordinated with school experiences.
2. Involvement of trainees in all phases of the school program including special services.
3. Experiences for interns provided on different levels rather than on just one grade level.
4. Involvement of both college staff and local school district in teaching courses on site.
5. Orientation sessions for interns starting the program.
6. The 30 weeks of full time experience within one school district.

Cooperating Staff Members

1. Full year internship within a school district.
2. Involvement of students in all phases of the school program including special services.
3. On site courses coordinated to experiences of the interns in the classroom.
4. The involvement of the College, local staff in the teacher training process.
5. Inservice program for teachers working with student teachers.
6. Following of the same calendar as the public school.

College Personnel

1. On site courses coordinated with school experiences.
2. Involvement of the trainees in all phases of the school program.
3. Experiences for interns provided on different levels.
4. Involvement of the school faculty, administration and college faculty in planning the program. Codirectors of the project from the college and school system.

5. Career exposure prior to graduation.
6. University coursework integrated with classroom experience.

II. The second question asked concerned aspects of the program that did not function effectively and should be avoided or eliminated in other similar programs.

Interns 1974-75

1. The communication between the college staff and school staff.
2. The chain of command.
3. The conflict between school and University scheduling.
4. The orientation program failed to identify the specific requirements and responsibilities.
5. The special needs of interns to register, get books, find living accommodations.
6. Involvement of interns in initial placements.

Previous Interns (1972-74)

1. Poor communication between college-school system and interns.
2. Having classes after full day of school.
3. Lack of interaction during the year between college and interns.
4. Evaluations not effectively communicated or relevant.
5. Poor orientation to the program.
6. Some courses not related to on-site experiences.

Cooperating Staff

1. Transition sometimes poorly done between assignments.
2. Lack of communication between personnel involved.
3. Too much freedom of interns in determining placement.
4. Too many courses while students are interning.
5. Lack of time for student-teacher planning.

College Personnel

1. Not enough time for library study, research and reading.
2. Possibly too heavy on "practice" as compared to "theory".
3. Lack of interaction of college personnel and children.
4. Insufficient use of local school resources in instructing the interns.
5. More emphasis on translation of methods into actual teaching practices.
6. Providing released time for students to travel to University to take care of registration and personal business.

III. The third question asked concerned aspects of features that were not a part of the Kennebunk program that should be considered for tryout in other similar program.

Interns 1974-75

1. Longer orientation period.
2. More course selections available on site.
3. More time allotted for work with the special service team.
4. More free time for exploration and visitation of other classrooms and school districts and for research at the university library.
5. Team meetings involving cooperating teachers, cooperating college staff members, school administrators and students.

Previous Interns (1972-74)

1. Providing interns a list of competencies to be learned.
2. On site workshops for both interns and cooperating teachers on new ideas and trends.
3. More course work made available in learning disabilities and remedial reading.
4. Involvement of trainees in school district the spring before their internship begins.

5. Visitation of other schools.
6. Regular meetings between college personnel, cooperating teachers and trainees.
7. More involvement of college and school staff in working with problem students.

Cooperating Staff Members

1. More complete orientation the year before or before school starts.
2. Participation of college and local S.A.D. staff in team teaching.
3. Involvement of cooperating teachers in course work after school so they could take courses for recertification credit.
4. Placement based on the teaching style - learning style of teacher and intern.
5. Awarding tuition credits to reimburse cooperating teachers.

College Personnel

1. Have full time resident teacher educator on site to direct and coordinate the program.
2. Free interns to visit other centers and exchange teaching assignments with other student teachers outside the system.
3. Extending the program from K-12.

IV. The fourth question asked whether there were any unexpected or unanticipated results from the Kennebunk program (both positive and negative).

Interns 1974-75

1. Experience led to more dedication to teaching as a career than before.
2. Sharing of ideas between groups.
3. Found new interest in special education.
4. Found that the grade level selected as being the one preferred is not the only one that is great.

5. Being given a travel allowance.
6. Being allowed to substitute.
7. The freedom to try and fail.
8. Being exposed to the emotionally disturbed and learning how to cope with them.
9. The expense of internship and difficulty for those who need to work.

Previous Interns (1972-74)

1. Experience led to rethinking of teaching as my career.
2. Experience led to more dedication to teaching as a career than before.
3. Close interpersonal relationships established through the program.
4. Even with the experience, no job.
5. Experience and teaching developed on other levels.

Cooperating Staff

1. College and school relationships became closer.
2. Enrichment of on going programs within the district.
3. Cooperating teachers can learn from the interns.
4. The great team work within the classes.
5. The strong, positive interpersonal relationships made between some children and interns.
6. Use of interest in aspects of learning disabilities.
7. Acceptance of program within the school district.
8. Experience with educating the interns helped with translation and transfer of theory and practice in more ways than we ever thought.

College Personnel

1. Not enough time to follow through with helping the interns in the Classroom. Too much time involved in travel.
2. Cooperation of the Kennebunk staff to reinforce aspects taught by college staff.

3. Teacher "ownership" of intern training function and process.
4. Lack of flexibility in professor's role expectations.
5. Interest by groups within the state about the program such as P.S.A.C.

V. The last question asked what were the strengths and weaknesses of the Cooperative Teacher Education Program. Partially each group has given some of the strengths in replying to the first question and weaknesses when replying to the second question. However, the replies are summarized for each group.

Interns 1974-75

Strengths

1. Better than student teaching, longer and more complete experiences with students, parents and the community as well.
2. Opportunity to apply knowledge at the time of learning.
3. Early experience helps in vocational decision making.

Weaknesses

1. Not enough time allotted for both courses and teaching.
2. Cost of the program for the student.

Previous Interns (1972-74)

Strengths

1. Full year experience.
2. Provides a more realistic picture of teaching.
3. More continuity and chance to observe child development.
4. Chance to apply courses to classroom experiences.

Weaknesses

1. Commuting distance.
2. More screening needed.
3. Lack of communication.

Cooperating Staff

Strengths

1. Provides better understanding of children.
2. Gives more extensive view of classroom management.
3. Opportunity for more involvement in community affairs.
4. Provides opportunity to refine teaching practices.
5. Provides wide experiences on all levels.

Weaknesses

1. Little interaction with others.
2. Lack of communication.
3. Lack of visitation of college personnel.
4. Need more interaction with all groups.
5. Selection procedures need improving.

College Personnel

Strengths

1. Opportunity to wed theory and practice.
2. Cooperative administration and faculty.
3. Enhancement of the professional feeling of the participating public school faculty.
4. Chance to become an integral part of the school, the system, and the community by full school year involvement.

Weaknesses

1. More time needed for research, reading and library work.
2. Too much emphasis on current problems and practices.
3. Campus involvement and socialization is minimal. Interns not kept informed about University activities.

Summary and Conclusions

There has been a mixed pattern of differences on achievement variables during the three years of the project. Overall, the results of the comparisons would indicate that the presence of an intern or lack of presence of an intern do not influence the group results on standardized achievement tests. Individual students who received individual attention may have increased in achievement from the contact with the interns though. The interns did change placement and did not remain in the same assignments for the full semester or school year. The faculty of the S.A.D. is a very experienced and professional group. Very little turnover is characteristic of the system. One might state the premise from a different perspective. The presence of the intern did not hinder or have a negative effect on the students within the district.

More systematic differences were found in the affective domain. Although students are in general pretty positive toward school, students in project classrooms tend to like school more, do jobs for teachers, like school subjects such as mathematics and social studies more than students in non project classrooms.

They feel that their teachers understand them, like more than one grown-up in the classroom and feel that grown-ups are trying to help them more than students in non project classrooms.

As far as mastering the cognitive objectives set up for them concerning the elementary school curriculum and teaching techniques and processes the interns each year have demonstrated their knowledge of these objectives.

The ratings of the cooperating teachers of the interns' performance and the interns self-ratings give indication that the student teachers have demonstrated mastery of the skills of teaching and have received high performance ratings.

Project teachers during the three year period felt they could individualize more, have more conferences with specialists and have a number of different activities going on in the classroom as well as leave the classroom more than non project teachers because they had interns available. The teachers during the three year period became more effective in the utilization of the students and were able to develop an efficient instructional team within the classroom.

All groups involved in the program felt that the year internship was an asset of the program for it provided an opportunity for students to translate course work and theory into practice, allowed them to have a variety of placements within the school and perform a variety of roles, and gave them on-the-job experience to aid in their career decision making.

The participants in the program felt that the cooperation of school district and university facilitated the training of teachers but orientation, communication, and coordination were areas that needed to be constantly evaluated and improved.

Students tended to rate the courses taken on site higher than courses taken on campus because they could translate course work into classroom practices. Liberal arts courses were rated lower than professional education courses; however, introductory education and psychology courses were rated lowest.

Recommendations

The authors of the report after viewing the on-site activities of the program and interviewing project personnel and interns and reviewing the data collected provide the following list of recommendations to groups interested in the training of teachers.

State Department of Educational and Cultural Services

1. Internship of teacher trainees should become a part of the guidelines for program approval for both undergraduates and graduates.
2. Cooperative Teacher Education Programs should be fostered with cooperation of all the types of units-state-university and public schools.
3. The state department should sponsor workshops on Teacher Training, especially on innovative approaches-as the Kennebunk Project.
4. The state department should grant recertification credit for on-site courses to encourage local staff personnel to become involved in course work so classes would have a mix of experienced and novice teachers as well as university personnel.

Universities and Colleges Preparing Teachers

1. Colleges and Universities should establish advisory councils that include state department representatives, college personnel, public school teachers and administrators, college students and public school students in setting guidelines for teacher education programs.
2. Colleges should be governed more by competencies of individuals rather than required semester hours and individualize teacher training programs based on the entry behavior of the students.
3. Colleges should involve more practicing public school personnel in teaching and guiding teacher education candidates.

4. More effort should be given to providing opportunities for students to translate theory into practice in the actual classroom.
5. Exposure to teaching and the realistic environment should be provided early to the teacher education candidates to help them make their career decisions.
6. Colleges should provide training and renewal sessions for teachers involved as cooperating teachers.
7. Courses taught on-site should be well planned and not an overload for staff. The courses should be opened to teachers in the area as well as to the trainees.
8. Alternate plans for staffing Centers should be considered. One alternative would be to have a "generalist" on site full time as opposed to a number of different professors teaching once a week.
9. The college should require the interns to follow the public school schedule rather than the college schedule but provide flexibility so that students can exchange placements briefly with other centers and districts.
10. The college should evaluate the program continuously and follow-up the graduates periodically.
11. Colleges should provide inservice credits for teachers participating so that they could take courses free on-site or on campus.
12. The college should have alternate plans available for students who decide they do not like teaching after the exposure or during the period of internship.

The School District

1. School districts should only become involved if they are allowed an active role in the teacher education process, and involved in the decision making and planning.
2. The district should designate a liaison person between the college, school district and students.
3. The district should nominate master teachers who could work as teacher trainers and teach on-site courses and allot free time for participation in the program and the planning required.
4. Sufficient time should be scheduled for conferences with the students involved in student teaching.
5. The system used to evaluate local school personnel should also be utilized to evaluate the interns in the program.
6. Students should be given early orientation to the program and be placed with teachers with compatible personalities and work styles initially.
7. The rules or roles expected of the interns within the district ought to be communicated effectively before the program starts and discussed periodically.

Students

1. The students should plan their schedule in such a way that they can give full time commitment to their placement.
2. The students should set up a flow chart or PERT chart so that they can function effectively and perform duties on time.
3. The students should be flexible in accepting assignments and placements, and not come in with too many preconceived ideas. Independent choice might prevent students from having experiences with different grade levels, types of students and types of teachers.

4. Students should accept the responsibility of being involved in follow-up activities and evaluation even after they graduate from a program.
5. Students should participate in career guidance programs and go through a program such as Holland's Self Directed Search and have alternate career plans in mind.